



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THREE JUBILEE VOLUMES

THE most delicate compliment that one could pay to a teacher or to a fellow student is to produce something in the field of his immediate interest and dedicate it to his name. The custom has thus arisen of issuing a volume of essays, contributed by friends and fellow scholars, in honour of a man who has devoted his life to scholarship. It gives the opportunity to his admirers to express their feelings of appreciation of his work without being forced to indulge in personal laudations and empty platitudes. These volumes, of which there are now quite a few in the field of Jewish literature, contain many valuable studies, the result of original research and investigation. The student, who in the future will consult these volumes, will always associate the individual contributions with the name of the celebrant in whose honour they were written.

I

THE LEWY 'FESTSCHRIFT'

Festschrift zu Israel Lewy's siebzigstem Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von M. BRANN und J. ELBOGEN. Breslau, 1911. pp. vi + 436 + 212 (תפארת ישראל).

Israel Lewy has long been recognized a master in Rabbinic literature, although his writings are but few in number. Not so much by what he actually accomplished as by the incentive he gave to others, and by the stimulus he offered to students through his acute reasoning and original propositions, did Lewy establish for himself an important position among Talmudic scholars. Having been connected for nearly thirty years with the Breslau Seminary, an institution from which came many of the present generation of Jewish scholars, Lewy also exerted

a personal and direct influence on modern Jewish scholarship. The touching references to the personality of the man in several of these articles are the finest testimony to the human side of the celebrant. Lewy first attracted attention by a short essay on the composition of the Mishnah, and later by another pamphlet on the Mechilta of R. Simon b. Yoḥai. His notes on the Jerusalem Talmud reveal to us the mature scholar and the deep thinker, and are brimful of brilliant suggestions. Scant as his literary productions are, they served as the themes for many a treatise and stimulated many a study in the domain of Rabbinic literature.

It is but natural that many of the contributions included in a volume which is dedicated to his name should deal with Rabbinic subjects, especially with early Tannaitic literature. The volume has two parts—a German (including also one essay in English), and a Hebrew part. The editors have done their work exceedingly well, and the touching remarks made in an introductory paragraph indicate that to them also it was a labour of love.

The German portion of the volume begins with an essay by W. Bacher, which consists of two lists of Palestinian and Babylonian Amoraim to whom Tannaitic traditions were delivered. These lists are arranged in chronological order and provided with many illuminating notes. This is part of a work which Professor Bacher had in preparation, dealing with the traditions that were delivered in the schools of Palestine and Babylon.

Another essay, dealing with early Tannaitic literature, is that contributed by Ludwig Blau. Following up his 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der Mechilta und des Sifre' in the Steinschneider Jubilee volume (1896), Dr. Blau offers here some very striking interpretations of several difficult passages in the Mechilta. His assumption that in many places, the abbreviations ר"א and ר"ב and ר"ב and ר"א are to be interchanged, is most plausible and is borne out by several passages which receive an entirely new meaning through the introduction of such a change. Many of the emendations found here are based on the text of Mechilta

de R. Ishmael, recently edited by D. Hoffmann. His emendation על מנת ליער (אלא) לא ימכור (p. 62) is much more probable than Weiss's emendation על מנת (שלא). For the distinction between נכרי and גוי, see also *Ḳiddushin* 19 b. Either of the two explanations found here on the difficult passage with reference to *Exod.* 22. 8 (p. 64) is much more convincing than Weiss's emendations, since the Masoretic text has ירשיעון and not ירשיעון.

The German part of the book concludes with an exhaustive treatise on the part taken by R. Simeon in the composition of the *Mechilta* which is attributed to him. The author, Dr. Louis Ginzberg, indicates in a note that this is a chapter of a larger work on this subject that he is preparing for publication. This article is most fittingly included here since Lewy was the first to write on the subject, and to formulate the opinion that R. Simeon had nothing to do with the work usually ascribed to him. Dr. Ginzberg, on the other hand, endeavours to maintain the traditional authorship of the book and establishes his thesis by a series of proofs. He first shows that the proofs adduced by Lewy against R. Simeon's authorship of the *Mechilta* are untenable, by quoting various passages and commenting upon them. Some of his explanations are rather forced, especially the one in which the *Mechilta* quotes an opinion of R. Simeon, contradictory to the opinion attributed to him in the *Babli* and *Jerushalmi* (see p. 412, where the word גורשה is forced to mean 'driven out' instead of its regular meaning 'divorced', and even then an emendation is necessary to reconcile the conflict; comp. *supra*, p. 114, n. 3. The first explanation given here תרי תנאי is more plausible). Still, our author's thesis is not impaired thereby, since he is well fortified by tradition and needs only show that the proofs against it are not sufficient to warrant its abandonment. Dr. Ginzberg's position becomes much stronger when he proceeds to array positive proof for the correctness of the traditional authorship of the *Mechilta*. He quotes nearly forty passages from the *Mechilta* in which an opinion is expressed, without mentioning the author's name

(סנהדרין), and this opinion is found in other places attributed to R. Simeon. This presents a most powerful argument for revising the assumption made popular by Lewy and others.

Dr. Ginzberg admits that the present text of the Mechilta is not exactly the same as it was when it left the hands of its author. It was, no doubt, edited by other hands, as is shown by the many opinions included therein to which R. Simeon would never have subscribed. He quotes several passages which apparently contradict opinions expressed by R. Simeon elsewhere and tries to minimize the contradiction by emendations or further interpretation. Not satisfied with this, Dr. Ginzberg goes still further to disprove the allegation that many of the sayings of R. Simeon appertaining to Exodus are missing in the Mechilta. He tries to show that some of the sayings attributed in the Mechilta and elsewhere to R. Simeon are not really his, or do not belong to Exodus. Hence they were omitted in the Mechilta attributed to him.

Incidentally, Dr. Ginzberg displays great erudition in interpreting many difficult passages in a novel and convincing manner. We look forward with eager anticipation to the appearance of the promised volume on this most interesting subject.

Dr. S. Horowitz offers some miscellaneous notes, mainly Halakic, on Sifre and Baraita. In his endeavour to show the origin of certain Baraitot, the author does not hesitate to emend the text. Some of these emendations, though apparently plausible, are forced and unconvincing (e.g. p. 197, his emendation to Ketubbot 3 b).

Fuller and more extensive notes to tractate Shabbat, both Babli and Jerushalmi, are contributed by Dr. S. H. Margulies of Florence. Some of these are quite elaborate and display considerable scholarship, as the excursus on the expression לְבַטֵּל בְּלִי מְהִיכְנִי (Heb., pp. 180-84).

H. P. Chajes publishes here several notes to Berakot which he had originally intended as additions to an edition of the notes on the Talmud by his famous grandfather.

A valuable study in the methodology of the Talmud is con-

tributed by Ch. Tschernowitz, which forms the initial article of the Hebrew portion of the book. In it he discusses the important principle of majority in the case of a conflict of opinion and lays down the following rule: The opinion of the majority became binding only when it was established by an actual vote at a special sitting of the Academy. The minority then had to submit to the opinion of the majority. Even then the opinion of the majority became binding only on those who were present at the time, while a future generation might reconsider the question, take a new vote, and decide it in accordance with the opinion of the majority of that time. As long as no vote was taken, although the opinion of the majority was known, any individual was justified in deciding for himself in accordance with the opinion of the minority. These principles, with the various modifications given by the author and corroborated by many quotations from Talmudic literature, may have practical significance, even at the present, should at any time a recognized synod assemble to consider matters of Jewish law and practice.

Dr. Adolf Rosenzweig begins his lengthy and exhaustive contribution on the 'Al-Tikri Deutungen' with a touching personal tribute to the celebrant. Beginning with an introductory chapter on the history of Talmudic exegesis, the author takes up in detail the various forms of the Al-Tikri methods of interpretations. He quite properly remarks, at the very outset of his thesis, that these interpretations were never meant as textual emendations, but, rather, as exegetical notes, used mainly for homiletic purposes. It was either wilful spite or their inability to understand the Rabbinic point of view, that made the Karaites criticize the Rabbis for this manner of interpreting Scriptures. The author then proceeds to analyse this method, quoting 172 cases of Al-Tikri interpretations, which he classifies into eleven distinct classes.

Dr. Rosenzweig probably overdraws the influence of the spread of Christianity on the method of interpretation followed by R. Akiba (p. 213). The difference between his system and that of his contemporary R. Ishmael was the result, more of the

personal characteristics of the two men than of their attitude to the sanctity and inviolability of the Scriptural text. The thirteen hermeneutic rules of R. Ishmael were not rules of logic. R. Akiba, instead of putting fetters on tradition (p. 214), allowed greater freedom to the student in the interpretation of Scriptures (see Weiss, *Dor*, II, p. 101, &c.).

Although the Hebrew text of the so-called Fourth Book of Ezra has not yet been found, it is generally admitted that the groundwork of this book is of Jewish origin. D. Simonsen endeavours to show the existence of a Midrash of the thirteen attributes of God (Exod. 34. 6, 7) imbedded in this book (ch. vii, ver. 132-9). His interpretation of 'iudex' in ver. 139 to correspond to נִוּשָׁא עֵין is particularly ingenious and sounds quite plausible. The 'higher Anti-semitism' of some of the modern Christian Bible students is severely scored in a note on p. 278, where it is shown how much prejudice may affect the investigations of otherwise liberal scholars.

Professor Krauss discusses various terms found in the Talmud to designate the places where the rabbis and their disciples assembled for study. Beginning with the terms מְקוֹם הַדִּין and פְּנֵי הַדִּין, he proceeds to explain in detail the term כְּרָם which he takes in its literal sense as over against the traditional explanation that it was used metaphorically (as also Levy in *Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, II, 408). The vineyard was used as a place of assembly for scholars because it was least likely to attract the attention of the Romans. In a similar manner Krauss also explains the term עֲלִיָּה which also served as a secret meeting-place. This leads to the explanation of the expression גִּת דָּבִי רַב in Sura, which was probably a large garden from which sufficient produce was obtained to sustain the large number of students that flocked there, numbering at one time 1,200.

Immanuel Löw endeavours to prove the identity of the Talmudic חֶצֶב with the sea-onion (*Urginea maritima*) which served the purpose of marking off the boundaries of fields as did also the Arabic *başul*.

Professor Büchler presents an exhaustive study on the manner

of betrothal as distinct from marriage, and the status of a woman betrothed to a priest in the first two centuries of the present era. He first discusses the various forms of betrothal and, incidentally, throws new light on several obscure passages in early Tannaitic works. The marriage contract (*Ketubah*) of the betrothed forms the subject of the second chapter, while the third chapter is devoted to the consideration of the status of the woman, betrothed to a priest. The author lays bare the influence of the economic conditions obtaining in Palestine, about and after the Hadrianic persecutions, on the marital relations in Jewry.

The exemption of woman from certain religious duties, according to Jewish law, is the subject of Dr. Zuckermantl's contribution. Following his theory regarding the antiquity of the *Tosefta*, he takes his sources mainly from this work and compares them with similar expressions in *Babli* and *Jerushalmi*. He discusses, in order, the obligations of woman regarding the reading of grace after meals, the blowing of the *Shofar* on *Rosh Hashanah*, *Zizith*, *Tefillin*, and other ritual practices. We should like to know his source for the assertion (p. 169) that women are obliged to attend public service on Sabbaths and Holidays. While it is true that women are obligated to pray, although there is quite a difference of opinion as to the nature of this obligation, we find no mention of the fact that they were obliged to attend public service (see *Shulḥan Aruk*, *Orah Hayyim*, 106. 1, and the comm. *ad loc.*). Incidentally, the author points out the exalted position accorded to women in the Jewish communal life and the development in the attitude of the law to women, as well as its influence on the social position of women. His imperative theme is the need in the present time to teach Jewish religion and literature to girls as well as to boys.

Basing himself on an expression used by the celebrant in an essay entitled 'Ein Vortrag über das Ritual des Pesach-Abends', Dr. J. Elbogen develops several ideas suggested there regarding the entrance and the exit of the Sabbath, in accordance with Talmudic sources. The entrance of the Sabbath was announced by the city official (*Hazzan*, חזן דמחא = קרתא) by

means of the blowing of a trumpet, the various signals of which indicated different steps in the approach and sanctification of the day. There was apparently no public worship in the synagogue on Friday nights in Tannaitic times, and it is very likely that there was none also on any other evening of the week. About the time of sunset the members of the household united in the principal meal, when the *Kiddush* was recited. The going out of the Sabbath was also celebrated with a meal, at which *Hab-dalah* was recited. The author also shows the various changes in the customs attending upon these occasions that were introduced later by the Amora'im.

While adding but little that is new or original, Dr. Armin Perls gives a clear and lucid presentation of the place of *מנהג* in Talmudic law and its relation to *הלכה*. It is a popular study, couched in an attractive style, which will also be of service to the student because of the numerous references quoted in the notes.

Another popular article is that by August Wünsche on 'The Kiss in Talmud and Midrash'. The various forms of the kiss, as well as the occasions for it, are given and discussed in almost unnecessary detail. It is questionable whether in an article of this kind it is necessary to put in translation lengthy passages, interesting though they are, as are here given, on pp. 81, 83, 85, 86, &c.

'Bible Stories and Bible History' is the theme of Dr. M. Gudemann's contribution. The similarity in the German expressions 'Geschichte' and 'Geschichten' prompts the author to devote several pages to a discussion of a philological nature, showing the development in the meaning of words. The author then endeavours to establish the thesis that the narratives in the Bible in which the early legends are freely used are historical. The tone of the whole article is rather polemic, the author taking every opportunity to refute the modern critical theories. The Creation, the Flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah are legends older than the composition of the Bible, the Bible making use thereof for religious and moral ends. They are not later additions to the Bible, but necessary components of the

narratives of Bible history which the sacred chronicler used with critical acumen and discernment. Dr. Güdemann's plea for the superiority of the Jewish conception of religion is quite stirring, though it is doubtful whether it is in place in a collection of articles supposed to be of a purely scientific nature.

Dr. Israel Abrahams, in a popular vein, discusses 'The Nine Worthies' in literature and art, in which David, Joshua, and Judah the Maccabee are often included. These pictures frequently represent a pageant, and the heroes are made to address the public. The author points out the fine tolerance that prompted the inclusion of these characters by Christian artists and poets. It is just as likely that the medieval Christian regarded these heroes, as well as all the other heroes of the Old Testament, as his own.

The philosophic articles in this volume are from the pen of Jakob Guttman, who is now the undisputed authority on medieval Jewish philosophic literature, and his son Julius Guttman, who has also made a name for himself in the same branch of study and research. The former writes on the relationship between the philosophy of Maimonides and that of Saadya, showing that although Maimonides does not mention Saadya by name, as he refrains also from quoting the names of other Jewish thinkers that preceded him, he refers to Saadya in several places, both when disagreeing with him, especially when the latter follows the Kalam, and also when agreeing with him. This, as the author admits, was already noticed by Abrabanel, who said that Maimonides's *Moreh* contains many references to Saadya's *Emunot we-Deot*, although not so mentioned. The author then quotes several passages from Maimonides, where the references are plainly to Saadya, in some of which Maimonides corroborates Saadya's opinion and even endeavours to defend them.

An excellent summary of Judah Halevi's religious philosophy as contained in his *Kuzari* is given by Julius Guttman. The *Kuzari*, according to our author, is the expression of the religious soul of its author; Judah Halevi's confession of faith. The truth of religion rests not on the basis of any philosophic speculation,

but on the inner conviction of the believer. We get to the most sacred ideals of the human soul not through the outward and frequently unreliable method of logic, but through the inner and immediate convictions of the human conscience, which are always certain. History corroborates the idea of God's providence over the individual and over the nation. Of course, Judah Halevi entertained no doubt regarding the absolute veracity of the narratives of the Bible, and thus could adduce them as proof positive of God's providence. The author then proceeds to analyse the Kuzari in the light of these fundamental ideas, and in the summary (pp. 355-8) he endeavours to show the relation of Judah Halevi's religious philosophy to the more modern religious philosophy of Kant and Schleiermacher.

The purpose and underlying principles of Jewish education are discussed with much religious fervour by Dr. L. Knoller. The final aim of Jewish education is sanctification of life, which is defined to be a kind of 'imitatio dei'. This was the aim which the Bible holds out for the whole nation of Israel, and this should also be the aim in the education of the individual Jew. Numerous examples from Biblical law support this assertion. The Torah is the guide that leads to holiness. By observing its precepts, one will attain to sanctification of life. The article, however, is too vague and general. The author fails to explain the application of these principles to modern Jewish education and entirely overlooks the national side of Jewish education, which is, perhaps, the more prominent in the Bible, and which may now need new emphasis.

Among the manuscripts published here for the first time, the contribution of Dr. Alexander Marx will probably be regarded as the most important. Dr. Marx presents five hitherto unpublished versions of what he regards to be parts of the *Seder Tannaim we-Amoraim*, the oldest attempt at a methodology of the Talmud. The text of this work has come down to us in a number of different versions, differing from each other widely. These five versions also present a considerable number of variations from the published text, and will be an invaluable

aid to a future edition of the work. While making no attempt at an exhaustive study of the text, Dr. Marx adds a number of suggestive notes and corrections.

Dr. A. Freimann gives the full text of the *פסקי אור זרוע* on Shebuot from a manuscript in the British Museum which contains the *פסקים* to Nezikin. The other parts were published before by Wilhelm Posen, and the *פסקים* to Shebuot are given here for the first time with some reference notes by the editor.

Early Midrashic literature is further enriched by the contribution of Dr. S. Schechter. He publishes a fragment of a Mechilta to Deuteronomy, which he identifies as being of a piece with another fragment which he made public some years ago in *JQR*, vol. XV, and which was later incorporated by Hoffmann in his edition of the Midrash Tannaim. This fragment contains comments on Deut. 11. 32 and 12. 5, 6, and presents several interesting points to which the editor calls attention in his notes.

I. D. Markon publishes several fragments of the Mishnah with the Babylonian superlinear vocalization. The text itself presents quite a few variations, which the editor carefully notes. The manuscript comes from the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, from which several other fragments were published before in *הקדם*, vol. I. The article is accompanied by five photographic reproductions of the manuscript.

The twenty-fourth chapter and part of the twenty-fifth chapter of Abraham ben Moses Maimonides *אלעזבדין כחאב כפאיה* are given with a Hebrew translation and several notes by Dr. S. Eppenstein. The editor does not deem it necessary to preface his work with a few remarks as to whence he obtained the manuscript and whether this was all that he found. He does not even refer to the fact that an attempt at a translation into Hebrew, of at least the first paragraph of this manuscript was made by B. Goldberg in his introduction to his edition of *מעשה נסים* (Paris, 1866). It would have greatly enhanced the value of this contribution if the author had added some introductory remarks concerning this work of Abraham Maimonides, which was probably the most extensive book that he wrote.

Dr. Israel Friedlander presents a lengthy fragment from the Schechter-Taylor Collection of the Genizah which Dr. Schechter believed to be part of the ס' הפקדון of Saadya. This assumption Dr. Friedlander accepts in face of a very serious objection noted in his introduction. The Arabic text is given in full and is provided by the editor with a Hebrew translation and with a number of illuminating notes.

Five Genizah fragments form the subject of Dr. J. Krenzel's contribution. The first is a Mishnah fragment of two leaves covering parts of Tractate Shabbat, and offering several interesting variations from the accepted text which the author discusses in detail. The second is a fragment of Mishnah Abot which agrees in the main with Lowe's edition of the Mishnah. The other three fragments, containing parts of Maimonides's Mishneh Torah, of Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch, and of the Pesikta Rabbati, are not given, but merely indicated, and the variants noted.

The variations in the customs of the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews are given in a manuscript which is now in the Munich State Library, and is published here by J. Finkelscherer. The editor carefully compares in his notes this manuscript with Müller's edition of הלוקה מנהגים and other sources and indicates the variations in his notes.

Dr. M. Brann brings to light a memorial prayer which was composed by a Hebrew teacher, Alexander Gutkind, in 1656, and which was recited in the synagogue of Schneidemühl up to the beginning of the last century. Steinthal refers to this prayer in the memoirs of his youth, but the text was entirely lost and was only recently discovered in a Machsor by Birnbaum, cantor in Königsberg. The prayer commemorates an attack upon the town of Schneidemühl in 1656, by the Swedes and the Poles, when thirty-three Jews were killed. Dr. Brann supplies the historical data regarding the unfortunate event, basing himself mainly on the ס' הזכרונות of the Posen Jewish community.

Heimann Arnheim's autobiography, which is here published for the first time by Dr. Max Grunwald, is an interesting

document, describing the wanderings and struggles of the poor student in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Arnheim wrote his autobiography when he was thirty-seven years of age (1833). His experiences are narrated in vivid and good Hebrew style, interspersed with some verses. The manuscript is now in the possession of the Gesellschaft für Jüdische Volkskunde in Hamburg.

Some years ago E. Baneth edited the Arabic text of Maimonides's commentary on *Pirḳe Abot*. In accordance with this text, the editor finds a number of errors in the printed edition of Judah ibn Tibbon's translation of the same. Baneth places here, in parallel columns, the accepted text of the Vilna edition and the improved reading, in accordance with the Arabic original, so that one may see at a glance the differences between the two. Since, however, most of the differences are only a matter of phraseology, it is questionable whether *מעות* was the proper word chosen to head the column of the quotations from the printed text. However, many of these corrections certainly help toward a clearer understanding of the text and may well be incorporated into a future edition of Maimonides's commentary on *Abot*.

In a discussion of the commentary on the tenth chapter of *Pesaḥim* attributed to Rashi, Max Dienemann leaves it doubtful whether Rashbam is an amplification of Rashi, or Rashi an excerpt from Rashbam. The many quotations from Rashi found in Rashbam may indicate that the latter had before him some notes from Rashi which the great commentator left in an unfinished form. This may also throw some light on the method which Rashi followed in preparing his commentaries.

The commentary on *Midrash Rabba*, attributed in many editions to Rashi, has long been regarded as spurious, although the real authorship of this commentary has not been established with certainty. Indeed, the commentary, as now published, is admittedly a combination of at least two works, as is explained by the editor of this commentary, Abraham ben Gedaliah ben Asher, in his introduction to the Venice edition of 1567-8. Dr. Theodor, who has made the study of the *Midrash Rabba* his specialty, takes

up anew in a lengthy contribution the discussion of the authorship of these two commentaries. He conjectures that the author of the first commentary was a disciple of R. Meir b. Isaac who came to Worms or Mayence from Italy. This view is opposed to the suggestion of A. Epstein in Berliner's *Magazin*, vol. XIV, and elsewhere, and to the opinion of other students.

Shalom Albeck, who is now engaged on a critical edition of the *Sefer ha-Eshkol*, the first part of which has already been published, contributes an illuminating article on the works of Judah b. Barzilai, and the use made of his writings by later codifiers. Our author is of the opinion that Abraham b. Isaac of Narbona's *Sefer ha-Eshkol* is nothing else but an abbreviated edition of one of the works of Judah b. Barzilai, and he supports his contention by weighty arguments. He also endeavours to show that the *Sefer ha-Orah* (which he reads 'ha-Oreh' = The Gleaner), recently edited by the late S. Buber and attributed to the school of Rashi, as well as several responsa collections, are based on or form excerpts from the works of the Barcelona Rabbi. The fact that a number of compendia by Judah b. Barzilai are known to have existed and are frequently quoted makes our author's theory quite plausible. Of course, he could make use only of the few published fragments, especially the *Sefer ha-Ittim*, edited by Halberstamm, for the purposes of comparison, but his arguments are so forcible that we should not be surprised if they should be more fully corroborated by additional works of that author that may be found in the future.

II

THE COHEN 'FESTSCHRIFT'

Judaica. Festschrift zu HERMANN COHENS siebzigstem Geburtstage: Berlin, 1912. pp. 721.

In the short period since emancipation was granted in most civilized lands, the Jews have contributed more than their share to the intellectual advancement of humanity. Many of them

have risen to great prominence in the various branches of art, science, and philosophy, and some have become leaders of thought and action in their favourite domains. Few of these, however, have brought back their newly gained experiences and knowledge to enrich the specific branches of Jewish thought and scholarship with their investigations. They permitted themselves to become entirely dominated by their new loves, remaining indifferent to every other demand of life. Some of them went so far as to renounce publicly their affiliation with Judaism, and consciously severed the bonds that united them with their brethren. There have, however, been a few who remained loyal to their early training and steadfast in their affection for the spring whence they drank their first draughts of culture and enlightenment. These few, after having established their reputation in the outside world, some of them becoming recognized masters in their chosen fields, came back with an extended vision and with a broadened standpoint, and applied these in an interpretation of Jewish ideals and Jewish beliefs. To these few chosen spirits Judaism and the Jews owe a great debt of gratitude, not only because of the tremendous influence their attitude has exerted upon the outside world as well as upon their own wavering brethren, but also because of the new values they have given to the old truths, which are so dear to every Jewish heart and so essential in the preservation of Judaism in the changed environment of the present.

Professor Hermann Cohen is one of the few distinguished sons of Israel, who, while enjoying a most enviable reputation in the domain of philosophy, still found time and energy to enrich Jewish thought and Jewish learning by his independent and thorough investigations. When still a young man, he achieved great prominence as a profound student of Kant and was soon recognized as the ablest exponent of the neo-Kantian school. During the many years of his occupancy of the chair of philosophy in the University of Marburg, that town has been the Mecca for many a young student who has been attracted by his wonderful intellect and his clear reasoning. He became

the leader among his peers in the intellectual circles of Germany, and later his fame spread far beyond the borders of his native land. His works are recognized as standards in the domain of philosophic thought, and some of them have enjoyed even a hearty popular reception. The inveterate prejudice against Jews in German scholarly circles was forgotten in his case and, for a time, Cohen was the only Jew occupying a professorial chair in a German University. In a history of modern philosophy, the chronicler will have to determine exactly to what extent Cohen's mode of thought was influenced by his early Jewish training and his extensive knowledge of Jewish sources (see Klatzkin in *Haschiloah*, XXIX, 1 ff.). Students of Jewish history, however, are especially conscious of the great debt they owe to Cohen for his studies in Judaism, to which he brings his acute mind and his extensive knowledge to elucidate prophetic and Rabbinic thought in modern phraseology. On the occasion of his seventieth birthday anniversary, it was felt by all Jewish scholars that this was an opportune moment to show their appreciation of his endeavours, in a distinct form, whatever others who admire his contributions to general philosophic thought might do to commemorate the occasion. This general feeling of appreciation and gratitude found its expression in the present volume, a lasting monument erected by a grateful band of scholars.

The forty-three articles included in this volume deal with a variety of subjects in the domain of Jewish scholarship. As may be expected, studies in abstract thought and speculation predominate here, being more in harmony with the life-work of the celebrant. The editors (Elbogen, Kellermann, and Mittwoch) have done their work exceedingly well, and the publishers saved neither expense nor trouble to make the book a most creditable production from every point of view. With the exception of two articles in English and one in Italian, all the articles are written in German, although the contributors include also several American scholars.

The book opens with an article by Max Wiener on the History of the Revelation Idea. The author draws a sharp distinction

between the conception of revelation prevalent in Biblical times and that generally accepted in post-Biblical times. The prophet believed himself to be the messenger of God. He heard God's message and he saw visions. This was indeed miraculous, but in an age of miracles it was not regarded strange. It became part of the very idea of God that He revealed Himself to the few chosen spirits of the nation. Revelation was regarded as a great boon to the nation, while its absence was looked upon as a punishment. The essence of revelation was accepted without question, although later it became necessary to distinguish different kinds of revelation and to determine the true from the false (Deut. 13. 2-6; 18. 18 ff.). In post-Biblical times revelation was accepted as an historical fact, and it was not until the middle ages, when rational investigation was applied to the study of religion, that the problem became perplexing. The Jewish philosophers of the middle ages, according to our author, entirely failed in this instance, when they endeavoured to determine the nature of revelation and thus remove it from the realm of the transcendental and miraculous.

More strongly worded is the criticism of Dr. Lewkowitz of Maimonides's theory of prophecy. Strongly influenced by Greek thought, Maimonides regards the intellect as the most exalted power of the soul, and the prophet becomes with him a speculative philosopher, who is urged to transmit his thoughts to the public by the divine will, the same will that urges also the philosopher to write down his thoughts in a book. Maimonides, according to our author, entirely overlooks the strong ethical consciousness, the deep emotions, and the consuming passion for righteousness that actuate the prophet's being. His attempt, therefore, to reconcile the prevalent notion of the prophet with his own rationalistic point of view is regarded by our author as a failure.

Germane to the same subject, although treated from a different point of view, is Hermann Vogelstein's study of the terms Torah, Prophets, and Wise Men in the development of the religious history of Israel. While we are certain of the existence

of priests and prophets, as distinct classes in ancient Israel, although their respective functions have by no means been definitely determined, we are not so certain of the existence of the **חכם** as a separate class, and we are still more uncertain as to the exact functions of this class. Proceeding on the theory that these three classes actually existed in ancient Israel, each with defined functions and duties, our author endeavours to show how **תורה** was first applied mainly to the ritual decisions rendered by the priests, and how it was only after the promulgation of the book of Deuteronomy that the term was made to include also the moral law. The struggle between priest and prophet, which continued for a long period, caused this combination of the two ideals for which each respectively stood, in the term **Torah**. The third category embraced the wise men, the educated classes, from which were selected the rulers and officers, both military and civil. It was a general term, including the notions of **Rosh**, **Shofet**, **Sar**, &c.

Vogelstein then proceeds to demonstrate that the judicial and administrative powers were distinct and separate, and both were distinguished from the priestly function which had to do mainly with the decision of ritual questions. His interpretation of Deut. 17. 8 ff. is not convincing. He has in consequence to regard the word **הכהנים** in 19. 17 as a gloss. What will he do with the passage in Deut. 21. 5, where **ריב**, which can only mean a civil case, is decided by the 'Priests the sons of Levi'? In this connexion, Judge Sulzberger's identification of the **כהנים** with the delegates of the federal government, as distinguished from the 'zikne ha-'ir', the local or cantonal officers, is more convincing ('Polity of Ancient Hebrews,' *JQR.*, new series, III, 50 ff.). It is altogether a hazardous task to seek for a definite division in the functions of the various departments of government in ancient times, since there was no doubt a great deal of overlapping of authority.

Our author then takes us further into the development of the meaning of these terms in exilic and post-exilic times, and shows how **תורה** came to mean the whole of the Law, and how **חכם**

came to denote especially the student of the religious law. The results of the higher criticism of the Bible are accepted by him as final, and he follows them implicitly. Thus the great emphasis laid by him on the revolution wrought in the religious life of ancient Israel by the promulgation of the book of Deuteronomy will be regarded overdrawn by many more conservative students. The subject, however, is lucidly presented and a number of suggestive ideas are brought out in the course of the article (comp. Kent, *The Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity*, for a more extensive treatment of the subject).

The first place in this collection should really have been given to Kellermann's exposition of Cohen's philosophy, in so far as it provided Judaism with a philosophic basis. In a lucid, almost popular style, the author shows how Kant's philosophy received a new interpretation and a firmer basis through Cohen's investigations, frustrating the attempts of Hegel and his followers to resuscitate Aristotelianism in modern days. While Cohen also gives a new meaning to Kant's standpoint regarding Logic, he becomes the master rather than the follower in his interpretation of the 'Ethics of the Pure Will'. More than this, by making the well-being of the state the end of moral conduct, Cohen identifies the philosophic notion of ethics with the notion of the Hebrew prophets. The idea of God is the spur to the realization of the laws of states. History is merely the field of action, showing the constant progress of the good. The victory of the good becomes possible only through the belief in the power of the good, which is identical with the belief in God. From this follows the eternal idealization of the present through a messianic future, the underlying thought of almost all the prophecies. It is especially in this respect that Judaism owes so much to Cohen for placing it on the sound foundation of philosophic thought.

The claim made by Lazarus that the autonomy of ethics is a principle of the Jewish religion has been refuted by Cohen in several places in his writings. No religious system would recognize moral conduct as autonomous. In Judaism particularly, ethical laws are regarded to be possessed of the same divine character as

are the ceremonial and other laws. They are all prescribed by God. Felix Perles, however, finds several sayings in the haggadic portion of Rabbinic literature and even in the Pseudepigrapha that point to the notion of the autonomy of the moral law as having existed among Jews. These references, which appear contradictory to the underlying principles of Judaism, are, according to Perles, borrowed from the Greeks and were introduced into the Jewish world by Philo, in whose writings he finds several passages which show his belief in the autonomy of ethics.

On closer examination of the references here quoted the difficulty does not appear to be so great as to make it necessary to construct a new theory regarding their origin. In fact, in all these passages, with the exception of one, ethical laws are not singled out, but the whole Torah is expressly mentioned. And even in the passage in Sifre to Lev. 18. 4, where the laws enumerated are mainly ethical, which forms the basis for Lazarus's thesis, it is not necessary to assume that the author had the idea of autonomy in mind. The idea seems to be rather that these laws are so self-evident and so essential that even if they had not been written it would be necessary (ברִינ) to write them down. The passage which conveys the idea that one who observes the Law is as if he had made it, may easily be interpreted in the sense of possession, as given in the case of the student of the Law (Raba in *Ḳiddushin* 32 b, *Abodah Zarah* 19 a based on Ps. 1. 2). The statement regarding Abraham's observance of the Law is already explained by our author himself in the sense that the revelation was made to him. In general, the idea conveyed by these passages is rather to emphasize the naturalness of the Law and its simplicity, but by no means suggesting the idea of autonomy.

The interest in Philo on the part of Jewish students has been considerably heightened recently, probably due to the excellent edition of Philo's works, being issued by Leopold Cohn. We thus find several contributions, dealing with Philo's philosophy, in this book. Leopold Cohn himself contributes a severe criticism

of a work by Eduard Schwartz, which deals with this subject. Schwartz, in discussing the Gospel of John, endeavours to show the close connexion between that book and the Jewish theology of the time. He denies the influence of Greek philosophy upon the Jews and goes still further, maintaining that Philo's works are nothing but an elaboration of the Rabbinic thought of that period and had very little in common with Hellenistic philosophy. He designates Philo as 'Rabbi', and speaks of him as 'that superficial chatterer' or in other such slighting terms. Cohn takes up his arguments one by one and shows conclusively that while Philo was no doubt strongly influenced by the Jewish mode of thought and belief, his writings were nothing else but an endeavour to harmonize the Bible or rather the Pentateuch with Greek philosophy. He takes up for special consideration Philo's teaching about the Logos, and shows how impossible that would have been from a purely Jewish point of view, and especially from the viewpoint of the Pentateuch with which alone Philo was familiar. This manner of reasoning was common only among the Alexandrian Jews who came in close contact with the neo-Platonists and the Stoics, and Philo merely put these prevalent interpretations and endeavours at harmonizing Biblical thought with the thoughts of these Hellenists in a literary form.

In popular form, and still characterized by thoroughness and depth, J. Horowitz gives a *résumé* of Philo's philosophy and his attitude to Judaism. The title ('Die Entwicklung des Alexandrinischen Judentums unter dem Einflusse Philos') is rather misleading, the greater part of the essay being devoted to Philo's mode of thought and the influences that acted in moulding it, and but little space being given to the development of Alexandrian Judaism, except by way of introduction. Perhaps the most interesting part of this article is where the attempt is made to show the relationship between Philo's philosophy and the theology of the Kabbalah and the religious philosophy of the rational school of the middle ages, of which Maimonides is the most illustrious representative. It is true that of the two phases of religious emotion, the ethical and the metaphysical, the former was given

greatest prominence in Judaism and was allowed to dominate Jewish life and thought for centuries. Still, the metaphysical and mystical, which find such prominent expression in Philo, were not entirely neglected in Judaism and found their expression in the Kabbalah and in the literature of the medieval religious philosophers. While the latter often introduced foreign elements in Judaism, which may have been fraught with the greatest dangers to the maintenance of the purity of the Jewish belief, they also helped to enrich the storehouse of Jewish lore and to broaden the horizon of Jewish thinkers of all ages.

Attempts have been made by several writers to show the influence of Philo's theory of the Logos on such expressions as **מִימְרָא**, **יְקָרָא**, and **שְׂכִינְתָא** found in Rabbinic literature. One who is familiar with the spirit of that literature will not entertain such a possibility. Still, no less an authority than Zeller takes that standpoint. L. Treitel, therefore, without introducing anything new or original, undertakes to show the real meaning of these terms. They were never intended to indicate the idea of another power in the world, an emanation from God, but were used in order to avoid anthropomorphisms in the translation of the Bible. Even the expressions **מַרְת הָרִין** and **מַרְת הָרַחֲמִים** do not indicate powers outside of God, but rather attributes of God, resting in His being. It is true that in the later liturgy the **מַרְת הָרַחֲמִים** is appealed to to intercede with God in our behalf, but this is obviously due to Kabbalistic influence. Nor can the angels in any way be identified with Philo's *λόγοι* or *δυνάμεις*. The former are poetic creatures, while the latter are parts of a theological system. Our author therefore reaches the conclusion that Philo's doctrine of intermediaries had not found an echo in the Palestinian schools.

J. Heinemann endeavours to show that the laws of oaths and vows found in Philo's writings betray a knowledge of the Jewish popular point of view regarding these subjects. It is true that Philo follows closely the Stoic doctrine regarding oaths, his very definition of the term being of Stoic origin. Still, his commendation of pious oaths shows the influence of the Jewish attitude.

When, however, the Rabbinic law differs from the Hellenic notion, he is inclined to follow the latter. As to the Rabbinic discouragement of any kind of vow, a view which, according to our author, was not shared by the mass of the people, comp. *Hullin* 2 b, *Tosafot*, *s.v.* **אכל**, and *Nedarim* 9 b.

The relationship between the Stoic philosophy and Rabbinic teachings has not yet been closely investigated, except in a few popular collections of parallel sayings and maxims drawn from these two sources. Dr. Bergmann attempts here a more scientific study of the subject. He first shows the possibility of an interchange of thought between the Stoics and the Rabbis, since the former frequently visited Palestine and some of them were even permanently settled there. The author then proceeds to show the similarity in the teachings of these two schools in various ethical and religious subjects, which he classifies under twenty-six headings. There are also quite a number of instances wherein Stoic and Jewish thought differ from each other considerably. These differences are due primarily to the essential differences in the mode of thought of these two schools. Stoic philosophy lacks the warmth of religion that permeates Rabbinic teachings; its religion is pantheistic; its ethics is based on intellectual sanction rather than on divine authority; its notions of sin, of charity, of pain are radically different from those held by the Jewish teachers.

That the sceptical philosophy of the Greeks was not entirely unknown to the Jewish medieval philosophers is shown by Horovitz (Breslau) in a well-written contribution. References to this mode of thought are found in the writings of Maimonides, Halevi, and especially Joseph ibn Šaddīk, although they had to obtain their information from secondary, often faulty sources. Saadya, however, shows a thorough familiarity with this special phase of Greek philosophy. From his efforts to refute the claims of Greek scepticism our author infers that this mode of thought had its devotees among the Jews of Saadya's time, against whom his arguments are directed. That there were among the Jews such as inclined to sceptical thought is also evident from references in the works of Ibn Ḥazm, who mentions one Jewish physician by name.

Medieval Jewish philosophy is represented by a few short studies. Jacob Guttman, who has shown in several other places that Maimonides was familiar with the writings of the Jewish thinkers who preceded him, although he does not mention them by name, proceeds here to show the influence of Abraham ibn Daud on Maimonides's philosophy. Abraham ibn Daud, the first Jewish Aristotelian, who made it his life-work to harmonize the teachings of Judaism with those of Aristotle and his Arabic followers, had even a more positive influence on Maimonides than Saadya. Our author even goes to the extent of suggesting that the very form of Maimonides's *Moreh*, its general divisions and arrangement follow closely to a large extent those of ibn Daud's work. Guttman takes up several characteristic topics in the works of both and shows their similarity of construction and argumentation, even of the proofs and quotations. The article is preceded by a glowing tribute to the celebrant and to his work in the field of Jewish philosophic investigation.

In a short essay Hartwig Hirschfeld endeavours to show that the purpose of Saadya in all his works, including also his *Kitab al-Amanat*, was to combat Karaism, which was a great menace to Judaism at that time, because of the many adherents it attracted from the great mass of the Jews. He quotes one example, the attitude to prophecy as expressed by Jefeth the Karaite, against which Saadya evidently directs his criticism in the very introduction to his *Kitab al-Amanat*, showing thereby the tendency of the work to be a guide to those Jews who were attracted by Karaitic teachings.

A congratulatory letter sent to Maimonides by one of his admirers forms the subject of Israel Friedlander's contribution. The only two occasions that may fit this document are Maimonides's appointment as court physician and his appointment as Nagid of the Jewish community. Our author inclines to the belief that this letter was written on the occasion of the latter event, and from internal evidence he infers that the writer was no other than Maimonides's favourite pupil, Joseph ibn Aknin. This identification lends additional interest to the document,

which is given in the Arabic original with a German translation.

Another Hebrew translation of Maimonides's מלות ההגיון, which would throw light on the rather obscure current rendering by Moses ibn Tibbon, will be welcomed by students of Maimonides as well as by students of logic. M. Chamitzer was fortunate in obtaining a copy of a translation made by Aḥitub of Palermo, who lived in the thirteenth century and who is but little known to Jewish history. The text is given in full, in the beautiful Hebrew type, copied from the type used by Abraham Conat of Mantua, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, in the printing of several Hebrew books, notably Gersonides's commentary on the Pentateuch. The editor presents also a few illuminating notes, but reserves a more thorough study of the manuscript and a comparison between it and the fragments of the original Arabic text extant and the current Hebrew translation for some future time.

A close study of the recently published commentaries on the Bible of Joseph ibn Kaspi, edited by the late Isaac Last, revealed to the late lamented Wilhelm Bacher a number of exceedingly interesting points, which throw much light on the character of this fourteenth-century Jewish philosopher. Ibn Kaspi was a close follower of Maimonides, and in some respects went even further than his teacher in his rational interpretation of Scriptures. From several of his comments we see that he studied his Bible from a literary point of view, regarded the prophets as preachers, who spoke to the people as occasion demanded and then collected their sermons, without regard to their chronological order, in book form. The prophetic books are the best commentary on the Torah. The Torah avoids philosophic terms and ideas, because it was primarily intended as a guide-book for the great mass of the people who are not familiar with philosophic terminology. Its language is simple, so that all people may understand it. The text of the Torah is perfect and allows of no emendation or correction. Special attention is directed towards Ibn Kaspi's declaration regarding the close relationship between man and

the other living creatures, including plants. All belong to the same family ; men, animals, and plants are all children of the same Father who called them into being. This is indeed a remarkable expression, coming as it does from the mouth of a medieval thinker.

Henry Malter discusses several Hebrew terms for nature used by medieval Jewish authors. The term *יצירה* is frequently used not in its original sense as creation or formation, but in the sense of the nature of man and his disposition, and the plural frequently indicates the various qualities that go to make up one's nature.

Various writers have attempted to find the sources of the Spinozistic philosophy in the Jewish religious philosophy of the Middle Ages, in the philosophy of the Renaissance, or in the teachings of the Christian scholastics. Since all these philosophies are based on the neo-Platonic interpretation of philosophy of Aristotle, so that even those who differed from him could not entirely escape Aristotle's influence, it is necessary to establish the relationship between Spinoza and Aristotle, in order to appreciate the course of his thoughts more fully. This is done here by Julius Guttman, who also gives an excellent *résumé* of the leading ideas in Spinoza's philosophy.

Jewish ethics and theology are represented by several articles. Kaufmann Kohler takes up anew an investigation of the 'golden rule' as found in Leviticus and its relation to the negative form found in Rabbinic literature and in the New Testament. Beginning with the consideration of the term *rea'*, which he regards as more inclusive than does Cohen in his *Ethik des reinen Willens*, making it include all men, Kohler proceeds to show that the idea was original neither with Jesus nor with Hillel. It is found expressed in the Book of Tobit and is especially emphasized in the Didaskalia and in the Didache. These two works, which are now generally admitted to be of Jewish origin, although in their present form they bear signs of Christian interpolations, contain these ideas in their groundworks. The argument is greatly strengthened by copious quotations from Rabbinic literature.

The high position accorded to manual labour in Bible and

Talmud is again emphasized here by S. Kalischer, in a popular essay. To work was as much following in the ways of God as to be holy. We are to be holy because God is holy ; we are to work six days in the week because God also worked six days. Labour is a duty, part of the life of man, and not a curse which he should shun. Idleness is condemned in the strongest terms. Our author also discusses in detail the various branches of industry which were followed by the ancient Israelites.

Forming the central idea in Jewish life and thought since the remotest antiquity, it was but natural that the messianic idea should find prominent expression in the Jewish prayer-book. Ismar Elbogen, in a short study, shows how this idea, both in its universalistic and national aspects, is expressed in almost all the prayers, whether designed for public or private use. He also points out how some of the early pre-destruction prayers were later modified to include the messianic hope. It is doubtful whether it was necessary for our author to assume the apologetic tone in this discussion. To pray for national regeneration and national well-being is natural and entirely appropriate and needs no apology. Such prayers do not preclude prayers for the realization of the larger, universalistic hope of the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth. The two ideas are found side by side in the prophetic books of the Bible as well as in our liturgy. It is therefore unnecessary and not even quite true to say that the prayers for a natural rejuvenation are the result of the 'jüngere Eschatologie'.

A strong plea is made by S. Hochfeld for the creation of a practical theology of Judaism, which should include the subjects of homiletics, pedagogy, liturgy, and pastoral work (Seelsorge). The author lucidly presents the distinction between an historical, systematic, and practical theology, and shows that while in the former two branches a number of helpful works have been written, very little has thus far appeared in the domain of practical theology, which really means the application of theological ideas to present-day, actual life.

An illustration of the practical theology is given in the

following article by M. Levin, who endeavours to emphasize the leading ideas that should predominate in the modern Jewish sermon. The author enters upon a consideration of the elemental truths of Judaism and their application to present-day life, and offers several concrete suggestions as to the subjects which should be discussed from the modern Jewish pulpit and the manner in which these should be treated.

Biblical exegesis and criticism are but slightly represented in this volume. S. Maybaum's 'novel' interpretation of four Biblical passages will not appear as novel to many students of the Bible. In two of these he mentions the authority that preceded him in such interpretation. His explanation of Isa. i. 18-20 has been anticipated in Mendelssohn's German translation of the Bible, while his comment on the third commandment is far-fetched and his objection to the accepted translation is not very strong (see Biur, *ad loc.*).

In a strongly worded article, M. Steckelmacher draws a striking contrast between the attitude to the Psalms held by the earlier and later Christian exegetes. Luther, Delitzsch, Ewald, and Hupfeld could see only the sublime and the beautiful in these expressions of the human heart in its relation to the divine. Delitzsch's motto to his commentary is 'What the heart is to the human body, the Psalms are to the Bible', reminiscent of Judah Halevi's simile regarding Israel among the nations. On the other hand, modern Christian Bible students, like Duhm and Gunkel, can find in the Psalms only an arrogant nationalism, an exaltation of ritualism at the expense of pure morality, a seeking after worldly gain and material rewards. The author skilfully exposes the crass prejudices of these 'higher Anti-semites', and shows, as has been shown many times before, that learning and supposedly scientific investigation are no proof against inveterate prejudice, that even scholars cease being exact and scientific when personal feelings and subjective beliefs overmaster them. Whether such criticism will serve as a warning to others or not, it is well that the truth should be told, and told in unhesitating terms.

H. Flesch endeavours to establish the thesis that the accents in the Bible bear traces of the influence of the traditional interpretation of Scriptures. While he avoids the discussion of the mooted question as to the period when the accents were introduced, he intimates that they must have been established after the development of the traditional law. The danger of such assertions lies in the possibility of the cause and the result being contemporaneous, so that it is not possible to define which was the stimulus for the other. Neither the accents nor the traditional interpretation of the Bible came into existence at one particular time, although the actual writing down of both must be assigned to distinct periods. The proof that the accents sometimes contradict the traditional explanation and still no one of the commentators seems to resent it, is very weak and simply shows that the great commentators of the Bible entertained a more correct attitude toward the traditional interpretation than our author. It is generally conceded that the builders of Jewish tradition, whether in the domain of Halakah or Haggadah, did not intend their interpretation to replace the ordinary meaning of the Biblical passage, and consequently no resentment was felt when the accent, which is presumed to follow the literal meaning of the verse, did not agree with its traditional interpretation.

Nor is our author more convincing when he produces the individual cases on which his thesis is based. In Gen. 32. 11, even according to the traditional interpretation, קַמְנָתִי should be joined with what follows. The difficulty in Lev. 25. 20 is not removed by making the accent rest upon the interpretation given in Sifre, *ad loc.* According to our author's construction, בַּשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִית should be joined with what follows. It is questionable whether the difficult passage in Ezek. 44. 22 can be translated, even disregarding the accents, 'eine Witwe jedoch, die von einem Priester hinterlassen wurde, dürfen sie heiraten'. We should expect אֵלְמָנָה מִכֶּהֱן rather than הִיא אֵלְמָנָה כֶּהֱן. However, the accent, obviously in harmony with Targum and Kīddushin 78 a, is not any more satisfying.

In a lengthy contribution, J. Horovitz deals in detail with

the so-called 'lex talionis' of the Bible. The article is mainly polemic in nature, the greater part of it being devoted to a refutation of the arguments of D. H. Müller in his 'Die Gesetze Hammurabis und die Mosaische Gesetzgebung'. J. Kohler, Harnack, and Eduard von Hartmann are also taken severely to task for their assumptions in dealing with the subject. Horovitz is well equipped for his battle, and his arguments are supported by the strong proofs of Jewish literature, in which he is entirely at home. The polemic and apologetic nature of the article, however, does not impair its scientific value. The author shows his wide learning and deep thinking especially in his notes, some of which are really independent studies. The main subject under discussion, the expression 'eye for eye, tooth for tooth, &c.', is treated in detail in a lengthy note on pp. 638-46, where it is compared with the old Arabic law and the Code of Hammurabi, and where also the development of the law in later Jewish legal history is given.

Adolf Schwartz, who has made the study of the hermeneutic laws underlying the reasoning of the Rabbis his specialty, has repeatedly emphasized that the Rabbinic mode of reasoning was in perfect harmony with the manner of reasoning displayed in the Bible, the system of logic developed by the Jews. The same laws governed the logic of the Rabbis as those of the Prophets, and even the form of expression is similar in both. That the *Qal wa-Homer* is found in the Bible has already been shown by an early tannaitic authority (Ber. R. 92, 7). Schwartz tries here to show the existence of the enthymeme, i.e. a syllogism in which one of the premises is suppressed, frequently met with in the Talmud, also in the Bible. He enumerates twelve cases of what he considers enthymeme, seven of which are found in Isaiah. Schwartz is gifted with a beautiful style and rich imagery of diction, which greatly enhance the value and interest of his contribution. He takes every opportunity to oppose the modern Bible critics in their emendations of the Biblical text, and frequently succeeds in presenting a striking and novel interpretation of the passage under consideration. Most novel, though

not entirely convincing, is his interpretation of the difficult passage in Amos 3. 12. His assumption that *פאת מטה* and *דמשק ערש* are proper names, indicating the poorer sections of the city of Samaria, needs further corroboration and proof.

The assertion frequently made by modern Bible critics that Talmudic jurisprudence is rigorous and relentless, quite different from that of the Bible, which is founded on love and mercy, has, according to Max Eschelbacher, no foundation in fact. Fairness and equity were frequently appealed to by the Rabbis, not only when in conformity with the law, but even in opposition to it. Not only the Bible, but the Talmud also places righteousness higher than justice. The many regulations of the Rabbis 'for the good of the world', 'in order to maintain peace', and the many regulations based on a liberal interpretation of Deut. 6. 18, conclusively prove that the Rabbis were at no time the slaves of the relentless law, but exercised a sense of fairness and kindness in administering justice. As part of the same tendency our author properly mentions the principle of *לפנים משורת הדין*, which makes it obligatory upon one to adhere to the larger laws of morality, even though not demanded to do so by the strict letter of the law. The spirit that pervades the Bible in its legislative portion strongly influenced the Rabbis in their efforts to elaborate the law in accordance with this spirit.

N. A. Nobel contributes the first part of a study on the Jewish law of pledge. The author brings his knowledge of Roman law to bear on the subject and shows the difference between the two systems in the very conception of the idea of the pledge. While opinions in the Talmud vary as to the nature of the pledge, it appears from the author's analysis of the sources that it did not imply ownership on the part of the creditor, nor even the primary right to buy it, when the owner wishes to dispose of it.

The existence of popular idioms and sayings, maxims and legends in the Haggadic literature has been noted by many students of the Talmud. Philipp Bloch, however, attempts to show that these quotations were taken not from the current

idiom of the people of the time, but from books and collections of stories and proverbs which were prepared for popular reading. He takes up for detailed consideration the *Pesikta de R. Kahana*, and shows that the Aramaic sayings and stories found there are taken bodily by the compiler from such folk-books as were extant at the time and were probably found in the library of every academy. As an illustration, he presents in translation a lengthy quotation, dealing with the folk-stories connected with the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai and his son Eliezer. The fact that there is no mention of such books does not militate against this theory. Our author regards the recently found Ahikar story, the so-called Targum Sheni to Esther, and the stories regarding the destruction of the Jewish state found in *Giṭṭin* 55 b ff., as well as a number of fragmentary sections in other parts of the *Haggadah*, as belonging to this class of literature.

The many attempts to identify the term *Min* found so frequently in Rabbinic literature, have not been successful, for the simple reason that the term denoted all kinds of heretics. A. Büchler quotes at length several passages in which the term can have no reference to Jewish heretics, but only to heathen Christians or to other heathens who were familiar with the Bible. There was apparently a large number of such *Minim* in the various centres of Galilee during the second and third centuries. We find them especially in places where there were also academies, and they were in the habit of conducting controversies with the Rabbis. From the disputes in which they participated several of the underlying principles of their beliefs can be ascertained. It is interesting to note that several of these arguments are found also in the writings of Justin Martyr. It is admitted, however, that in many places where *Minim* are mentioned in the Talmud, Jewish heretics only are meant. Our author does not discuss the nature of the heresies of these *Minim*.

Immanuel Löw gives three more chapters of his treatise on the Aramaic names of amphibious animals, other chapters of the same work having appeared elsewhere. He takes up for detailed consideration the chameleon, the crocodile, under which the

interesting Leviathan legends are discussed, and also the turtle. His wonderful familiarity with Semitic as well as classic languages, and with their respective literatures, is shown here to great advantage.

Two important contributions included in this volume deal with the recently-discovered Aramaic papyri at Assuan. Eugen Mittwoch presents a most ingenious explanation of the historic background of the Elephantine documents relating to the rebuilding of the Temple at Jeb. His assumption that the priesthood in Jerusalem was antagonistic to the rebuilding of the Temple by the Jews in Elephantine, while the Samaritans were in favour of it, sounds exceedingly plausible and solves several difficulties which present themselves in the study of the three documents dealing with this subject. Bagoas compromised between the two contending parties, allowing the rebuilding of the Temple on the condition that only meal-offerings with the accompanying libations should be offered there, but no animal sacrifices. This explanation appears to offer the correct solution to the problems presented by these papyri.

Ludwig Blau takes up for detailed discussion some of the legal documents of the same collection, and shows the striking similarity between them and the demotic documents of Egypt as well as with those of Greek origin. Incidentally he points out how these forms have been preserved also in Rabbinic literature, although to this phase of the subject he had devoted a special study which appeared elsewhere. Blau further shows the similarity between the *syngraphophylax* of the Greeks in Alexandria and the earlier Aramaic form of the same document. In connexion with this he explains the incident narrated in Jer. 32, which apparently contains an example of the use of this form of document, considering the *התום* and the *גלוי* as really one document made in the manner of the *συγγραφοφύλαξ*, and further shows its connexion with the *גט מקושר* of the Talmud. Our author sees the difficulty in the phrase *הספרים האלה* in ver. 14, which apparently indicates the existence of two distinct documents. It is more likely that the incident in Jeremiah describes a custom

that obtained in ancient Assyria where the document was enclosed in a clay case on the outside of which the main contents of the document were repeated (comp. Amram, *Leading Cases in the Bible*, pp. 177-84).

Later Jewish history is enriched by several valuable contributions. Siegmund Salfeld brings together several extremely interesting documents dealing with the efforts of the last Duke of Mayence, Karl Joseph von Erthal (1774-1802), to improve the miserable condition of his Jewish subjects. Especially interesting are the documents relating to the attempts made then to improve the educational facilities in the Ghetto and the apparently wholehearted devotion of the Duke to the cause of Jewish emancipation.

Quoting from the ordinances pertaining to the status of the Jews in Hessen Cassel during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, L. Munk throws much light upon the abject position of the Jews in that province. The humiliating orders compelling the Jews to listen to Christian sermons preached in their behalf, the restrictions placed upon their mode of worship, the many taxes and tolls exacted from them, must have made their lives most miserable. Fortunately, many of these ordinances were apparently never carried out in practice and remained a dead letter, very much like the equal rights enjoyed by Jews to-day in some countries of Europe—on paper.

Some letters and poems written by Wilhelm Wolfsohn to Berthold Auerbach form the subject of Ludwig Geiger's contribution. These letters contain very little of distinctly Jewish interest, and their author was only an indifferent Jew, though he remained loyal to his descent in face of many temptations. Wolfsohn was a fluent writer and speaker and enjoyed considerable prominence in his days, although now he is almost entirely forgotten. Geiger gave an extensive account of his life and activities in the *Jahrb. f. jüd. Gesch. u. Lit.*, 1911, and these letters will serve as a supplement to that article.

The present writer regrets his inability to appreciate fully the value of the Italian contribution by Umberto Cassuto, because of his unfamiliarity with that language. Cassuto discusses the

quotation from the sermons of Giordano da Rivotto (1304), where references are made to the conversion to Christianity of a large number of Jews in Puglia. Güdemann denied the truth of this statement, but our author endeavours to show that there was a number of crypto-Jews in that district, who may have been the descendants of these early converts.

Of a more miscellaneous character is the pleasant *causerie* contributed by D. Simonsen, in which several interesting subjects are entertainingly discussed. Apion's accusation that the Jews worshipped the head of an ass, the connexion of Ahasuerus with the Wandering Jew, the origin of the term Ashkenaz denoting Germany, and several other points are reviewed and, in some instances, novel comments and explanations are offered.

The Tobit drama, which was extensively presented during the sixteenth century in various parts of Europe, is shown by Israel Abrahams to have been derived, to a great extent, from the story as then current among the Jews. A version of this story is found in Joseph Zabara's *Sefer Sha'ashu'im*, recently edited anew by Israel Davidson, and the English version of this story is also given by Abrahams in his *Book of Delight and Other Papers*, pp. 43-6. Abrahams also shows in this essay that some of the foreign elements introduced in the drama are based on midrashic legends, current among Jews.

A. Freimann publishes for the first time, from a unique Vatican MS., Meshullam b. Kalonymos's polemic against the Karaites. This consists of nine paragraphs, dealing with Karaite mistaken interpretations of Biblical passages. While these replies were known to many medieval authors, who refer to them, they have never been published in full. The editor has provided them with a brief introduction and some illuminating notes to the text.

Karl Kautsky's theory of the origin of Christianity, as laid down in his *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1908), is analysed and criticized by Alphons J. Sussnitzki. While all the earlier writers on the subject seem to be interested mainly in the spiritual conditions, the moral struggles or the political changes that prevailed at the period under discussion, Kautsky

approaches his subject from the standpoint of historical materialism and seeks the origin of Christianity rather in the material and economic conditions that obtained then in Rome and in Judea. Indeed, he carries his premises a little too far, especially when he enunciates his novel and superficially attractive theory about the mercantile tendency of the early Jews being the stimulus for their conception of monotheism. As Sussnitzky points out here, using a phrase of Hermann Cohen, it is an extremely unsafe practice to make economic and material relations the causes of spiritual phenomena. The principal thesis presented by Kautsky, however, is novel and interesting and merits further investigation.

III

THE KOHLER 'FESTSCHRIFT'

Studies in Jewish Literature, issued in Honour of Professor KAUFMANN KOHLER, Ph.D., President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, May 10, 1913. Berlin, 1913. pp. vi+301. Portrait.

The appearance of a volume of scholarly contributions in honour of an American Jewish scholar is an event, the first of its kind, that will be welcomed with deep gratification by all lovers of Jewish learning. Although German by birth and early training, Dr. Kohler may rightly be claimed by the American Jewish public as their own. He arrived here when but a youth, and his activities as Rabbi and teacher have been exercised among the Jews of this land for more than forty years. As a religious reformer, he exerted a potent influence on the course of the development of this movement in Jewry, and as a scholar he has produced works that are of lasting value. He made the study of Jewish theology his specialty, and the volume which he published, dealing with this subject, is recognized as a standard work. His interest in Hellenic literature has resulted in numerous

contributions to periodical publications, and these are frequently quoted with respect by students. An exhaustive list of the literary labours of the celebrant is given in this volume (pp. 266-301) by Mr. Adolph S. Oko, Librarian of the Hebrew Union College. The compiler enumerates 512 items, adding explanatory notes wherever necessary. This number of articles, pamphlets, and books does not include the large number of articles Dr. Kohler contributed to the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (289) and the editorial work he did for that great work as well as for several periodicals.

This volume, published in his honour, bears testimony to the appreciation of his worth, not only by those immediately associated with him in his work, but also by men from abroad, who stand foremost in the domain of Jewish scholarship. It is somewhat different from other volumes of a similar character, inasmuch as the personal element is rather conspicuously brought to the front in this volume. An excellent photograph of the celebrant is introduced here as a frontispiece, and the first three articles deal with the personality of Dr. Kohler, his work in behalf of Reform Judaism, and a *résumé* of his most important literary contributions respectively. It is a great pity that the book is so full of misprints. This is probably due to the fact that it was printed abroad and the editors, David Philipson, David Neumark, and Julian Morgenstern, were anxious to have it ready for the time of the celebration, so that the proof-reading was neglected.

The volume opens with a biographical sketch of the celebrant, written by his son, Max J. Kohler. While the writer apparently endeavours to give merely the facts in the life of his father, the article is naturally and properly coloured by filial piety and pride. The second article, 'Kaufmann Kohler as Reformer', is somewhat less subjective, dealing as it does with ideas and theories. Dr. Philipson, the writer of this article, in a systematic and orderly manner, presents the views of the celebrant on several of the leading thoughts underlying Reform Judaism, giving, wherever possible, his very words, culled from the numerous articles, sermons, and books that he wrote on this subject. Naturally,

it would be the height of impropriety for one to express disagreements or offer criticisms in such an article. Dr. Philipson goes a step further. He even tries to reconcile conflicting ideas expressed by Kohler at various periods in his career on some important questions of Jewish life and practice. The same is true also of Dr. Neumark's characterization of Kohler's *Systematic Theology*. While lacking in perspicacity and, at times, also faulty in diction, this article contains a very good summary of the book, the most important individual work that Dr. Kohler has thus far produced in the domain of Jewish scholarship.

Biblical study and investigation are represented by five short articles. Prof. Bittenwieser endeavours to show the importance of Zachariah (why not Zechariah?) as a prophet. He complains of the fact that Zechariah's prophetic greatness has been underrated by modern Bible students and points out the high level of spirituality in his prophecies.

'The Exodus and the Bible' is the title of Prof. Engländer's contribution. In it the author seeks to establish the tremendous influence that the memory of the Exodus period had on the development of Judaism during Biblical times. He shows how new meaning was given to various old institutions by connecting them with the events of the Exodus; how the Exodus was used by the prophets to serve as a source of hope and faith in the mercy of God and His readiness to help Israel in times of trouble. At the end of the article the author gives two lists of passages—one of passages in the Exodus narrative, in which ethical and religious laws are enforced by referring them to the Exodus, and another of passages in the other books of the Bible, which contain references to the Exodus narrative.

Prof. Margolis endeavours to solve the puzzling translation of the Septuagint of the phrase in Joshua 4. 4, **אֲשֶׁר הָבִין מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The LXX rendering *τῶν ἐνδόξων* for **הָבִין**, while admittedly paraphrastic, is still regarded by the author to have a basis in the text. In his search, Dr. Margolis finds that while **הָבִין** in the Hebrew text undoubtedly means 'prepared', referring to ver. 2, it may

also mean 'established' and have reference to establishing in rule or government. The translator had in mind the twelve princes of the tribes, men of honour and position, and took the word **הַכִּין** to include this additional significance. The second alternative presented here that the translator had in mind the word **כֵּן**, meaning rank or position (cf. Gen. 40. 13; 41. 13), is less likely, while the third alternative offered by the author that the translation has reference to **כְּנָה** is discarded by the author himself. Dr. Margolis takes this opportunity of enumerating several Hebrew equivalents of the LXX $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$, some of which are accompanied with very illuminating suggestions. The article concludes with a graceful congratulatory paragraph to the celebrant, deduced from the passage last considered.

Entirely after the manner of the higher critics of the Bible, Prof. Julian Morgenstern attempts a critical analysis of Gen. 14, trying to find therein the various strata from which it was composed. He regards vv. 11-24, omitting vv. 18-20, as the original of the story, a post-exilic Midrash, designed to enhance the glory of Abraham as a warrior. This narrative may have had an opening sentence, in which the name of the adversary was given, but this was suppressed by a later editor, who supplied the greater part of the 'introduction' (vv. 1-10). The author regards the entire chapter as probably the latest portion of the Hexateuch.

Rabbi Ephraim Frisch takes it as his task to establish the historicity of the 'Reformation of Hezekiah', which some modern critics are inclined to doubt. The author rightly assumes that if the arguments against the historical character of the narrative cannot be sustained, it is safe to believe that the passages relate an actual fact. Together with many other modern Biblical students, the author disregards the narrative as given in 2 Chron. 29. 3-30. 2, which he takes to be an embellishment by a later ecclesiastical scribe. The most important source is 2 Kings 18. 4, and this passage forms the subject of the discussion here. In a convincing manner and with considerable force, our author refutes the arguments against the historicity of

this verse one by one. The argument that the Prophets of the time did not speak against the objects which Hezekiah is reputed to have abolished is well set aside by the contention that outside of the fact that they do speak against these cult-objects, they were concerned mainly with the inner religiousness of the people. The argument that these cult-objects were regarded legitimate after Hezekiah's time is answered in the manner of the Talmud *אֵינָהוּ נִזְרָה וְלֹא קִבְּלוּ מִיְיָהוּ אָתָּה . . . נִזְרָה וְקִבְּלוּ מִיְיָהוּ* (Hullin 6 a). The author does not make any effort to explain the nature of the most important of Hezekiah's reforms, the destruction of the brazen serpent, perhaps because this he considers outside of the scope of his article (see Ewald, *History of Israel*, IV, p. 173, note; Sinkler, *Hezekiah and his Age*, p. 55). It may be in place here to point out that the reference to Hullin 6 b is interpreted not as a conscious act on the part of his ancestors, but rather as an act of Providence to make them overlook this, so that Hezekiah might have this work to his credit (see Mahrsha and Maharam, *ad loc.*; comp. also Tos., *ad loc.*, s.v. *אֵלֹהִים מָקוֹם* referring to a different answer given to the same query in the case of Josiah in Shabbat 56 b). The author shows a praiseworthy spirit of reverence and a familiarity with the literature on the subject under consideration.

Dr. Israel Abrahams contributes a most illuminating essay on a rather novel subject. 'The Decalogue in Art' is his theme, a subject presenting many interesting points for the student of history and archaeology. Possessed of an amazing amount of information in Jewish and secular subjects, Dr. Abrahams draws freely from all kinds of sources regarding the treatment of the Decalogue in Jewish and Christian art. The origin for the introduction of the Ten Commandment Tables in the synagogue is not known. The author suggests the possibility that it was copied by the Jews from the custom that predominated in the Reform churches, but he regards this suggestion as rather hazardous. He has no proof of its use in the synagogue before the Reformation period. This, however, is no proof of its absence from the synagogue before that time, especially since

there was no uniform mode of the internal decoration of the synagogue and, even to-day, the custom of placing the Decalogue Tables in the synagogue is by no means universal.

The real nature of the differences that existed between the Pharisees and the Sadducees has been the subject of many a speculative study, for the reason that the sources at hand are mainly such as emanated from the Pharisaic school, and it could hardly be expected that the Pharisees would be entirely fair and impartial in their treatment of their opponents. Prof. Lauterbach attempts in a lengthy essay to offer a solution to this problem. According to his view, the Sadducees, who were the descendants of the aristocratic priestly families, were the direct followers of the Soferim, who were, our author believes, almost exclusively members of the same family. The Soferim were the custodians of the Law and the recognized authorities on all matters of law and practice, and this position was held also by the Sadducees. They believed that they had the right to add new laws and decrees, as new conditions may demand, but refused to recognize these new decrees as of equal importance with those of the Torah. They did not wish to seek support for their decrees in the Torah, since they believed themselves vested with the right of adding decrees, which, however, were only for the time being, and may at any time be abrogated, while the laws of the Torah were permanent and unchangeable. The lay scholars, who gradually rose to power, since the beginning of the Greek rule over Palestine, denied the priests the right of introducing new institutions, which were not provided for in the Torah. The Torah they regarded as all-sufficient for all times, and would therefore not accept any new law which had no basis in the divine Law. They dared not abrogate institutions that had taken hold of the people and become part of their lives, but endeavoured to find for them support in the written Law, and, when not successful in that, regarded them as of equal antiquity with the Law.

Our author works out this theory in detail and is quite successful in presenting a plausible thesis. One of his basic

arguments is taken from the incident narrated in Neh. 10. 30, where the people are said to have pledged themselves by oath to observe the Law of Moses. The Sadducees, according to our author (p. 187, note), regarded their obligation to keep the Torah as being derived from this oath and not from the intrinsic divine nature of the Law. Hence, it was sufficient if they observed the laws prescribed in the Torah, so as not to break the oath, which carried a curse with it. The Pharisees, on the other hand, claimed that the authority of the Law lay in its divine nature and was not due to an oath imposed outside of it. The stress laid on the oath by our author seems somewhat strained. An oath was taken in order to enforce certain laws which the people were in the habit of breaking. Some such laws are enumerated in the same chapter, and the nature of the oath in this case appears not much different from the oath taken by 'the priests, the Levites, and all Israel' to send away their foreign wives, in the time of Ezra (Ezra. 10. 3-5).

It is also doubtful whether the Soferim were all of priestly lineage as surmised by our author (pp. 180, 182, note 1). The Levites, of course, are frequently mentioned as members of this guild (see especially Neh. 8), but there were probably many Israelites among them as well (comp. Neh. 10. 29, כל יודע מבין). Still, even if we regard the later Pharisees as having been the direct followers of the Soferim, it may still be true that the authority of the priestly element, which predominated for a long period, was unquestioned until the lay element has become more powerful. The author promises to discuss the subject more fully in a special work which he has in preparation.

Prof. Bacher contributed a short study of the much-discussed Talmudic phrase חלכה למשה מסיני. Without attempting to make any general deductions or to present a more satisfactory interpretation of this phrase than has hitherto been given, the author cites twenty-four cases where it is used in Talmudic literature. We fail to find in this article any more light on the subject than that thrown by Weiss in his excellent chapter, in which this subject is fully treated (*Dor*, I, ch. 9; cp. also *Lewy-Festschrift*, p. 212).

The article, however, has its value for the student, because of the array of the sources and because of the illuminating notes with which this is accompanied.

Prof. Krauss takes as his subject an exceedingly interesting social custom of the Jews. He endeavours to show the ethnological principle underlying the permission and encouragement given by the law to one to marry a sister's daughter. He first shows how all sectaries, beginning with the Zadokites, through the early Christians, the Karaites, the Mohammedans, and even the Falashas, forbid such a marriage. He then proceeds to present the Pharisaic point of view, quoting the Baraita in Yebamot 62 b and Sanhedrin 76 b, where such a marriage is regarded as a meritorious act, on a par with other acts of highest virtue. To the reasons quoted by the author in the name of Rashi and the Tosafists might be added the reason given in Rashi to Sanhedrin 76 b, which is also accepted by Maimonides (*Issure Bi'ah* 2, 14) and consequently extended also to a brother's daughter (comp. Maggid Mishneh, *ad loc.*, where a psychological reason is offered). Our author unnecessarily emends Rashi (p. 168, n. 5), for *אשתו* there refers to his own wife, i.e. his niece, in the spirit of the reason offered by Maggid Mishneh (*ומבשר לא תחעלם*). Two additional reasons are given in Tosafot Yeshanim to Yebamot 63 a. One is because the sister would find it more difficult to find a suitable husband for her daughter than the brother would for his daughter. The other reason, also quoted in Tosaf. to Yebamot 99a, *s.v.* *ספק*, is more convincing. It is a greater merit to marry a sister's daughter than a brother's daughter, because in the case of the latter the Yibbum could not be performed. The endogamous propensity of the early Israelites is evidenced in numerous narratives of the Bible, and the reference to *ומבשר לא תחעלם* by Rashi and Maimonides is based on sound intuition. Dr. Krauss's attempt to connect this with an old matriarchate principle is not convincing, at least as far as the Pharisaic viewpoint is concerned. Our author, however, has succeeded in throwing considerable light on a subject that is rather obscure.

Dr. Elbogen's suggestive, though not exhaustive, contribution

might well serve as an introductory chapter to a study on the Jewish Liturgy. The author first introduces a few striking instances, by which he wishes to show the manner in which the subject should be studied. In a second chapter he discusses the Mishnah in Tamid, ch. 5, which treats of the prayers offered by the priests during the morning service, and which is regarded as the oldest source of a regular service. The study of this important text, which is full of difficulties, is very illuminating, although several of these difficulties are left unsolved by the author. The suggestion that the phraseology was influenced by the actual practice in later times when the Mishnah was edited, should have been further elaborated, since it will tend to destroy to a large extent the value of the source. Dr. Elbogen, however, speaks with the authority of the expert, since he has made this special branch of Jewish literature his own, and his remarks are therefore full of suggestiveness and value.

That the Karaites, whose main principle apparently was that the Scriptures had no other significance than that indicated by the ordinary and simple meaning of the words, were guilty of employing the allegoric method of interpretation, is shown in an illuminating article by Dr. S. Poznański. The main task of our author is to show that several of the most prominent Karaites employed the allegorical method in the interpretation of certain legal precepts, by which they gave entirely new meanings to the passages under consideration, although the practices they enjoin may have been in vogue long before their time among other sects. Examples of such method are given from 'Anan, Benjamin Nahawendi, Daniel Kumisi, and Kirkisani. A sample section of the Kitab al-Anwar, by the last-mentioned author, is given here as an appendix. The author also gives, as a second appendix, the text of a part of Josef b. 'Ali's commentary to Genesis, in which the author conducts a polemic against Saadya for interpreting the vision of Abraham (Gen. 15) in an allegorical manner. The third appendix is taken from the same author's commentary to 1 Sam. 14. 32-5.

Prof. Schechter publishes a Midrashic fragment from a manu-

script in his possession, which he thinks is a part of the lost Midrash Yelamdenu. The text is provided by the editor with a short introduction and with a number of notes of reference and improved readings. In several instances the editor admits his inability to make the text clear. We might suggest a slight correction in the text on p. 264, which would remove the difficulty mentioned there in n. 13. If we substitute למה for שמה the reading will be very much in the same spirit as the remark in Tanhuma, ed. Buber, Noah XI, למה לנה נזכר, למה לחיה ולבהמה.

The purpose of the Levirate Marriage and its relation to the social status of women in ancient Judea are discussed by Rabbi Israel Mattuck. Rabbi Mattuck is of the opinion that the institution was established with the view of benefiting the widow, who would have had no status, since she had no children. He takes up first the section in Deut. 25 verse by verse and comments upon each verse. (For the suggestion that לאיש ור is a gloss upon החוצה, see Ehrlich, *Mikra ki-Peshuto*, *ad loc.*) He then proceeds to discuss the law itself, comparing it with the few cases of levirate marriage recorded in other parts of the Bible. While it is true that the question of inheritance is an important factor in this law, the emphasis laid by our author on the benefits accruing to the widow is somewhat overdrawn. It appears that the main point at issue is the establishment of an heir to the parental estate, even though the heir be a fictitious one. The references in Ruth and in Rabbinic literature, however, point very strongly to the reason of making provision for the widow. The author's argument that this law is found only in Deuteronomy, where the moral and ethical aspect of the laws receive greatest emphasis, is also deserving of consideration. The Halizah ceremony is regarded by our author as one of the ancient forms of divorce, which became necessary, since the childless widow was regarded as the wife of her husband's brother immediately upon the death of her husband, and a formal divorce was necessary in order to release her (comp. Hitzig, *Psalmen*, lx. 10, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, *ad loc.*, and Wetzstein in the Excursus at the end of the latter volume).

A large number of the poems written by medieval poets are devoted to the subject of admonishing the soul against the allurements of the material world and reminding her of her true nature and destiny. Many of these poems have found their place in the liturgy. Prof. Goldziher endeavours to show in a brief contribution the connexion between the theme of these poems and the theme of a similar class of poems in Arabic, which are classed under the general heading of *Mu'atabat al-nafs*. He regards it quite likely that the Jewish poets were influenced to adopt this attitude, which borders very closely on the ascetic, from their Arabic contemporaries. This mode of thought received an additional stimulus by the introduction of neo-Platonic philosophy in Arabic-speaking countries, which exerted an influence on Jew and Moslem alike. The instigation to the soul to take account of its actions (*חשבון הנפש*) naturally formed the next step in the development of this thought. To this, Jewish thinkers, notably Bahya, devoted much space in their works, regarding it as the best means towards humbling the soul and making it put forth efforts for improvement and correction.

'Kawwana: the Struggle for Inwardness in Judaism', is the title of a very interesting article by Dr. H. G. Enelow. *Kawwanah* is a term difficult of precise definition 'for the reason that it kept on gathering significance from the religious experience of the Jewish people'. The author sets out with the purpose of tracing the meaning of this term in Jewish literature and its application in Jewish life. He shows its connotation in Bible and Talmud, the stress laid upon 'inwardness' not only in prayer but also in the performance of all religious acts, until he reaches to the importance attached to it by the Jewish religious philosophers of the Middle Ages. He then shows the deterioration of the idea into the mystic and esoteric speculations of the *Zohar* and later Kabbalistic works, until it was again rescued by the Hasidim and modern reformers. The *tendenz* displayed by the author in the last few paragraphs of the article detracts considerably from the scientific value of his contribution. The author would make us believe that the whole trend of later Jewish life was saturated with the mystic notions of the Kabbalah, which, of course, is not

true. It is the impression that one obtains also in reading the German edition of Graetz's History (not the Hebrew translation), against which modern students of Jewish history strongly object. Perfunctoriness in prayer and in the observance of other ceremonial acts was decried by Jewish leaders of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as well as by those of the ninth and tenth centuries, and the multiplicity of *kawwanot* does not necessarily make *Kawwanah* impossible. Our author also fails to notice the influence on the maintenance of the pure devotion by the great zeal for study and intellectual investigation, especially as it manifested itself in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries among the Jews of Poland. In spite of these defects, the author succeeded in presenting a lucid treatment of a subject that needs new emphasis at the present time.

In his analysis of Luzzatto's devotional work, *Mesillat Yesharim*, Dr. Emil G. Hirsch shows how truly modern the old Jewish thinkers were, if we only take the trouble to translate their words and thoughts in modern phraseology. This little book has only recently been introduced to the outside world in two German renderings. Dr. Hirsch's summary in English will help to spread the well-deserved fame which the book enjoyed among Jews for nearly two centuries. The 'Path of the Righteous' is mainly an ethico-religious treatise, and the author manages to steer clear of the mysticism which played such an important part in his life. Even in the last chapter, where Dr. Hirsch sees traces of mysticism, the evidence is not conclusive. It may be understood in the light of the oft-quoted phrase of *הבא לטהר מסייעין אותו*, so that 'holiness' is not to be regarded as the direct gift of God, but rather as coming to the one who makes sincere efforts to attain it through divine assistance. Dr. Hirsch points out in several instances the great difference between Luzzatto's conception of life here and in the hereafter and the prevalent conceptions of the dominant church on these matters. The article concludes with a neat, homiletic interpretation of the catalogue of the cardinal virtues, treated in the book, as applied to the celebrant. It is a pity that this

otherwise excellent summary of a most interesting work is marked by several inaccuracies in quoting references and in translating Hebrew phrases, due mainly, no doubt, to misprints.

Dr. Louis Grossman writes on the subject of 'Principles of Religious Instruction in Jewish Schools', a subject to which our author has devoted his energy and best powers, especially in recent years. Perhaps it is because of our high anticipations that we meet with disappointment after a careful perusal of this article. Instead of laying down several well-defined principles of Jewish pedagogy, as the title would lead us to expect, Dr. Grossman gives here some general contemplations on education in general, its defects and drawbacks, and on Jewish education in particular. He fails to present a clearly-defined purpose for Jewish education as such, and even brings contradictory views on that subject in the course of his article. The plea is made for the recognition of child-life on the part of the teacher, a plea which is timely and fully justified. The development of the child into proper manhood and womanhood is the main duty and business of the secular as well as of the religious teacher. The subjects taught are only the means toward that end. Still, besides that general end, the Jewish religious teacher must have a more specific purpose in view. His purpose should be to bring up a generation of Jews. 'We teach Judaism not to uphold it, but to uphold our childhood in it', is a fine rhetorical sentence, but will not be subscribed to by most people who have given thought to the subject of Jewish education. It is true, Dr. Grossman himself fortunately does not adhere to this principle, and gives also some emphasis, especially in the last few paragraphs, to the idea of the purpose of Jewish education as distinct from secular education, but he does not give to it sufficient prominence as a 'principle', or rather 'the principle', of Jewish religious education. The essay contains a number of valuable, practical suggestions, but these are often drowned by a mass of rhetoric, which obscures the subject and detracts from the value of this contribution.

'Dreams as a Cause of Literary Compositions' forms the subject of a short essay by Prof. Henry Malter. The author

quotes a number of interesting incidents from medieval Jewish literature where it is recorded that certain literary compositions, even decisions of cases of law and interpretations of difficult passages, were suggested to their authors in dreams. Dr. Malter does not attempt to go deeply into the subject and to analyse the psychology of such assertions and their probable veracity. In a note to his introductory chapter of his edition of Palquera's *אגרת החלום* (*JQR.*, new series, I, 457, n. 10) Dr. Malter expresses his belief in the truth of at least this author's assertion and promises to deal further with the subject in a series of articles. In this connexion the incident of Joseph Caro's reputed *מגיד* and its relation to Socrates' *δαιμόνιον* would make quite an interesting study.

JULIUS H. GREENSTONE.

Gratz College.